

# MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS PANEL MINUTES

## 21 MARCH 2012

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Bill Stephenson

**Councillors:** \* Tony Ferrari \* Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
\* Keith Ferry \* Joyce Nickolay (1)  
\* Thaya Idaikkadar \* Varsha Parmar (3)

\* Denotes Member present  
(1) and (3) Denote category of Reserve Members

### 79. Attendance by Reserve Members

**RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

Ordinary Member

Councillor Susan Hall  
Councillor Phillip O'Dell

Reserve Member

Councillor Joyce Nickolay  
Councillor Varsha Parmar

### 80. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members.

### 81. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2011 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

## **82. Public Questions, Petitions, Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rules 51, 49 and 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution) respectively.

## **RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

### **83. Strategic Update**

Members received a report of the Corporate Director of Place Shaping which provided an update on the Area Action Plan (AAP) and other issues, projects and proposals affecting the Heart of Harrow. The Chair welcomed Esther Kurland, Urban Design for London, and David Rowe, Transport for London, to the meeting.

#### **TfL Modelling**

Members received an officer presentation on the Area Action Plan Traffic Model. During the course of the presentation, the officer summarised the preliminary findings, showed the key junctions map and junction performance summary, outlined the model scenarios which gave an indication where queues would form and reported the average network speeds. He concluded that the AAP proposals would lead to approximately an additional 1,620 journeys in the morning and 2,400 in the evening. In addition, it was anticipated that 7 junctions would significantly worsen due to the AAP and network performance results showed that there would be approximately a 3% reduction in speed.

Following the presentation, Members asked questions and made comments which were responded to as follows:

- specific junction modelling would be carried out for each development and the network management team would keep the transient flows during the construction phase under review;
- the mitigation measures would consider a range of issues and some of these would be funded by TfL and some by developers. There were, however, other measures already in place. The creation of land use policy in the AAP to increase local employment would also help to reduce travel demand;
- responding to Member's question about trip figures, the officer advised that these were based on data from similar developments which were generally comparable and that further details could be provided on request.

## Smoothing Traffic Flow

Members received a presentation from Esther Kurland and David Rowe entitled Street Ideas. The presentation is available to view on the Council's website.

Ms Kurland advised that the aim was to have better balanced streets and that there was a need to consider what streets were for, such as movement and place. She outlined the guiding principles as follows

- there was a need to understand a street's function and that the character of a place should be reflected;
- the street should 'be the stage and not the star';
- decide the degree of separation;
- avoid over elaboration as simple schemes were often the most successful and would last;
- opt for quality, easy to maintain schemes;
- work with users.

Following the presentation Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- The over-riding problem in Harrow was the limited number of north-south routes, resulting in congestion in Station Road and Harrow View. The lack of space on these routes to increase capacity would deter visitors or people working in the area. Mr Rowe suggested that there were solutions that could address the space issue and referred to some of the examples shown in the presentation. In addition, cycle parking and car sharing could lead to a reduction in the proportion of people needing to use a car. Responding to the Member's comments that this would not address the problems at junctions, Ms Kurland advised that it was necessary to make the most of the capacity available and to consider other options as it was not possible to meet the demands for car travel.
- A Member sought solutions to address the issues in Station Road and was advised that the Council was engaging with TfL on this issue and that Land Securities were considering options for the Kodak site. Another Member suggested that lighting may be a solution and was advised that this could make Station Road seem less like a through route. Smoothing was another option that could be considered to get traffic moving. Members indicated that they would like to see practical proposals for Station Road and the Divisional Director undertook to talk through the issues with his team.

- A Member sought clarification as to the cost estimate for the proposals and was advised that it was impossible to quantify as it was time related. The AAP estimates in relation to infrastructure requirements, including transport, schools and health, were to be in the region of £100m. The development industry had funding and had a role to play in mitigation. The Divisional Director added that it was currently expected that Land Securities would resolve the Headstone Drive junction. In order to address Members concerns he would ask the relevant officer to prepare an estimate of the work done with Alan Baxter Associates.

The Chair thanked the representatives of TfL and Urban Design for London for their presentation, attendance and responses.

### **Infrastructure Projects**

Members then received an officer presentation which provided a brief summary of infrastructure projects and was summarised in section 5 of the report. The presentation can be viewed on the Council's website. The officer advised that some of the projects would be funded via the capital programme and others by the Outer London Fund (OLF). There would be a capital investment of £4.5m over the next 2 years which would build on the projects developed through round 1 of the OLF.

Following the presentation, Members expressed support for the receipt of the OLF and thanked officers for their work in this area.

### **Applications Update**

The Divisional Director of Planning gave a presentation which provided an update on the latest position in relation to a number of sites.

### **Kodak**

The Divisional Director provided an overview of the proposals for the site and reported that key revisions to the proposals were the reduction of 1,000 square metres of retail use, an addition of B2 general industrial use, a refinement of the green link and of the building heights in the parameter plans. He reported that the key outstanding issues included phasing, the transport impact assessment, school place provision and delivery and the access to Headstone Manor.

The Panel was shown the revised illustrative master plan and the parameter plan. The Divisional Director reported that there were still concerns in relation to the green link and how to cross Harrow View, the road that ran through the site. He also reported that as the Goodwill junction was problematic, a roundabout option was being considered. In terms of coach access to Headstone Manor there were issues to address with the Environment Agency as the access would cross a flood plain.

The Divisional Director advised Members that it was expected that further consultation would be carried out shortly and that there was a provisional date

for a special meeting of the Planning Committee to consider the application of 10 May 2012.

Following the Divisional Director's presentation Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- Members expressed concern at the proposal for a roundabout at the Goodwill junction as they, as ward councillors, had not been consulted. Officers were advised that there was a long history of issues with this junction. The Divisional Director advised that Land Securities had come forward with options. The difficulty was the land available and a technical exercise had been done to look at the appropriateness. There were no pedestrian facilities at the junction and the option to explore the use of a roundabout at this location was one that officers had encouraged Land Securities to explore. A Member requested that ward councillors be advised of the issues in relation to the proposals.
- A Member questioned the proposed number of student accommodation units and how the number had been determined. She also sought clarification as to how these units could be adapted if they were not taken up by students. Another Member stated that student accommodation did not fit any of the criteria in terms of income per square foot. The Divisional Director responded that a Greater London Authority (GLA) policy placed a requirement on the provision of student accommodation.
- In response to Members' requests that they be permitted to ask questions of the applicant in relation to student accommodation, the Corporate Director of Place Shaping that it would not be appropriate as it was a live planning application and instead he offered to obtain a written response to Members questions.
- In response to a Member's question in relation to the retention of the Kodak chimney, the Divisional Director advised that this was a commercial decision for Land Securities following their pre-application consultation with the community.
- A Member questioned whether there was a possibility of having insufficient retail floor space as a result of the revisions reported by the Divisional Director and was advised that the small comparison goods units had been identified as posing a risk to Wealdstone and local shops at Headstone Parade. Officers had considered lean trips and sharing of trips and if 2% of trade could be attracted from the proposed new supermarket to Wealdstone, this would be addressed. The intention was to make it feel safe for people to go to Wealdstone to do their evening shop.
- The Divisional Director confirmed that the reduction of 1,000 square metres of retail space would have a small effect on employment.

- The Divisional Director stated that no assumptions could be made in relation to the primary school and the Council had assumed no planning permission at this stage. Discussions were ongoing with the school team.

### Lyon Road

The Divisional Director gave a presentation in relation to the Lyon Road site and advised of the amendments received on 12 March 2012. A report was being drafted for the April Planning Committee and Members were advised that there would be an extensive pre-Committee site visit. He added that there would be consultation on the revised plans.

### Panel Working Arrangements

The Divisional Director reminded Members of the background to the existing working arrangements of the Panel and drew their attention to the note prepared by Legal Services appended to the report. The proposed amendments would bring the arrangements in line with the Localism Act.

The Chair thanked officers for their presentations and it was

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise)

That the amendments to the “Protocol on meetings with the Major Developments Panel”, as outlined in Appendix 2 of the report to take account of the provisions on Predetermination set out in the Localism Act and the Head of Legal Services’ guidance note in Appendix 1, be agreed.

(Reason for Recommendation): The proposed amendments would bring the arrangements in line with the Localism Act.

**RESOLVED:** To note

- (1) the initial results of consultation on the Preferred Option for the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan;
- (2) the preliminary findings of a joint project with Transport for London (TfL) to test the cumulative impact of development in the AAP area, making use of TfL’s West London Sub-Regional Transport Model;
- (3) opportunities to smooth traffic flow in the Harrow and Wealdstone Intensification Area, in the light of a presentation by TfL officers;
- (4) the programme of infrastructure and other projects in Harrow Town Centre to be implemented over the next two years, following the in principle award of £1.758m under Round 2 of the Outer London Fund, and provisions in the approved Capital Programme;
- (5) details of the planning applications that had been submitted for the Kodak and Lyon Road sites.

(Reason for Decision): To provide an update on issues, projects and proposals affecting the Harrow and Wealdstone Intensification Area as part of the Panel's oversight role.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

### **84. Update on Various Projects**

The Panel agreed to consider, as a matter of urgency, a schedule which provided progress on various sites around the borough in order to receive the most up to date information available.

The Divisional Director of Planning reported that the administrators of Bradstowe House had now received bids. He had received three calls from separate developers in relation to this site so he was hopeful that proposals would come forward. In terms of the Colart site, pre-application consultation with the community was now underway.

The Corporate Director of Place Shaping provided an update in relation to Whitchurch Pavilion and advised that a Forum would be held on Monday 26 March at Whitchurch School at 7.00 pm. The statutory advertising had been placed on 9 February 2012 with a closing date of 9 March 2012 and he advised that there would be a report to Cabinet in May 2012. A Member stated that he had been contacted by a number of residents, including the Chairman of the residents' association who had instigated the call-in of a previous Cabinet decision on Whitchurch Pavilion, about the advertising and late notice of the Forum. In addition, the Chairman of the association had not formally been invited. The Corporate Director responded that 4,000 leaflets had been delivered in the locality on 19 March, giving a full week's notice. It had been the consensus of the consortium's management that this was the optimum notice period. He undertook to take on board the Member's comments and requested that Members advise him if there were any other interested individuals/parties who should be invited to attend.

In response to requests from Members, the Divisional Director undertook to include Whitchurch Pavilion and change control in future schedules.

### **85. Future Topics and Presentations**

Members considered which items they would like to receive at their next meeting. The Divisional Director of Planning advised that currently it was intended to submit items on Infrastructure Delivery, an update on the property review and the Area Action Plan Regulation 27 and other Development Plan Documents. In addition, he advised that the Transport for London Director for borough partnerships had been approached about attending.

**86. Termination of Meeting**

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 48.2 (Part 4D of the Constitution) it was

**RESOLVED:** At

- (1) 9.55 pm to continue until 10.15 pm;
- (2) 10.13 pm to continue until 10.20 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.37 pm, closed at 10.19 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR BILL STEPHENSON  
Chairman